

REMARKS:

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-16 were originally filed. Claims 1-7 were canceled in the February 20, 2004 Preliminary Amendment. Claims 8-16 were withdrawn and new claims 17-22 were added in the April 5, 2007 Amendment. Claims 17-22 stand rejected in the June 18, 2007 Office Action. In this Amendment, claims 8-16 are canceled, claims 17-22 are amended, and new claim 23 is added. Support can be found throughout the specification. No new matter is introduced. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 17-23 will be pending.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of rejection in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 17-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Galopin *et al.* (Abstract 0056, 224th American Chemical Society National Meeting, Aug 2002). Examiner further alleges that the enhancement of salty taste would be inherent to that of Galopin *et al.* (*See*, Office Action, page 2, lines 9-15). Applicants respectfully disagree and request reconsideration for withdrawal of the rejection.

Independent claim 17 is directed to a novel compound, 2,6-nonadienamide, N-ethyl-, (2E,6Z). Galopin *et al.* neither teach nor suggest the claimed compound, let alone a method of using it. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is novel and patentable over Galopin *et al.*

Claims 18-23 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 17. A claim that “depends from a prior claim” incorporates all the limitations of the prior claim (*See*, 35 U.S.C. 112, 4th paragraph). When an independent claim is patentable over the prior art, its dependent claim should be deemed patentable as it incorporates all the limitations of the independent claim and further limits the independent claim. Since independent claim 17 is believed to be patentable over Galopin *et al.* for the reasons set forth above, claims 18- 23 are also believed to be

patentable over Galopin *et al.* For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that this 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(f)

Claims 17-22 further stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(f). Examiner alleges that the Applicants did not invent the claimed subject matter (*See*, Office Action, page 2, lines 17-21). Applicants respectfully disagree and request reconsideration for withdrawal of the rejection.

For the same reasons set forth above in connection with the 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) rejection, the claimed invention is distinct from the Galopin *et al.* disclosure. Galopin *et al.* do not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of rejections, and allowance of all claims now present in the application.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any required fees, including any extension and/or excess claim fees, any additional fees, or credit any overpayment to International Flavors & Fragrances Inc. Deposit Account No. 12-1295.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: September 7, 2007

XuFan Tseng (Reg. No. 55,688)
International Flavors & Fragrances Inc.
521 West 57th Street
Law Department – 10th Floor
New York, NY 10019
Telephone: 212.708.7163